IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20-1-2005

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.MARKANDEY KATJU, THE CHIEF JUSTICE
and
THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE N.V.BALASUBRAMANIAN

W.A.Nos.4059 & 4060 of 2004 and
WA.MP.Nos.7648 & 7649 of 2004

and

W.P.Nos.30650, 27332, 24209, 24210, 25652, 25653, 33824 to 33834, 33850 to 33858, 33866 to 33874, 30980, 32989, 34136, 34514, 28281, 27358, 24523, 24248, 25377, 26148 to 26153, 26906, 26907, 28799, 33557, 33558, 34528, 32210, 35771 & 36883 of 2004

and

W.P.M.P.Nos.37136, 33250, 29392, 29394, 31173, 31175, 40904 to 40914, 40936 to 40944, 40956 to 40964, 37542, 41640, 34339, 33281, 39906, 41267, 29799, 29447, 30851, 31780, 31782, 31784, 31786, 31788, 31790, 32770 to 32773, 34989, 40555, 41654 and 39007, 44258 & 43059 of 2004

.....

W.A.No.4059 of 2004:

I.Saraswathi.

... Appellant.

vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu, rep.
By its Secretary to Govt.,
Education Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai.

2.The Principal,
Ragas Dental College and Hospital,
No.2/102, East Coast Road,
Uthandi, Chennai 600 119.

... Respondents.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

W.A.No.4060 of 2004:

1.Deepta Ramarao
2.R.J.Rajalakshmi
3.Shubhakara,L
4.S.K.Gayathri
5.Ramya,D.
6.S.Dhanalakshmi
7.E.Sandhiyaa
8.M.Deivanayagi
9.U.Durga
10.V.sangeetha
11.Kapil Dev Kumar,S.
12.T.T.Kathikeyan
13.E.P.Kailash Nath
14.G.Yvaraja
15.M.Premkumar
16.R.Antonette Rhea
17.S.Subha
18.T.Anitha
19.G.Devi Rathna
20.S.Nasreen
21.V.Subashini
22.A.M.Ramhya
23.S.Menagapriyatharshini
24.S.Karthikeyan
25.M.Ganesh Kumar
26.M.M.Ramya Devi
27.A.Sasi Rekha
28.J.Gifrina
29.C.Indumathi

... Appellants.

vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu, rep.
By its Secretary to Govt.,
Education Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai.

2.The Principal,
Ragas Dental College and Hospital,
No.2/102, East Coast Road,
Uthandi, Chennai 600 119.

... Respondents.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

WP.24209/2004

1 ST.JOSEPH'S COLLEGE OF ENGG.
REP.BY ITS CHAIRMAN
OLD MAMALLAPURAM ROAD
CHENNAI-119 ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED
FOR FIXATION OF FEE PVT.PROFFESSIONAL
EDN.INSTT.REP.BY ITS SECRETARY.
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,.CHENNAI-9

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP.BY ITS
REGISTRAR,SARDAR VALLABAI PATEL
ROAD,GUINDY,CHENNAI-25. ..Respondents

WP.24210/2004

1 ST.JOSEPH'S COLLEGE OF ENGG.
REP.BY ITS CHAIRMAN
OLD MAMALLAPURAM ROAD
CHENNAI-119 ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED
FOR FIXATION OF FEE PVT.PROFFESSIONAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTT.REP.BY ITS SECY.
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,.CHENNAI-9

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP.BY ITS
REGISTRAR,SARDAR VALLABAI PATEL
ROAD,GUINDY,CHENNAI-25. ..Respondents

WP.24248/2004

1 PANIMALAR ENGINEERING COLLEGE
ESTABLISHED BY JAISAKTHI
EDUCATIONAL TRUST, REP BY ITS
SECRETARY, CHENNAI 602 103 ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE
CONSTITUTED FOR FIXATION OF
FEE FOR PRIVATE PROFESSIONAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, CH-9

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY, REP BY ITS
REGISTRAR, SARDAR VALLABHAI
PATEL ROAD, GUINDY
CHENNAI-25. ..Respondents

WP.24523/2004

1 MUTHAYAMMAL ENGINEERING
COLLEGE, EST. BY MUTHAYAMMAL
EDUCATIONAL TRUST BY CO-ORD.
VADAPALANI, CHENNAI-26 ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTD
FOR FIXATION OF FEE FOR PVT.,
PROFESSIONAL EDU. INST. BY SECRETARY.,
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPT.,CHENNAI

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY BY REGISTRAR
SARDAR VALLABAI PATEL ROAD
GUINDY, CHENNAI-25 ..Respondents

WP.25377/2004

1 MAHENDHRA ENGINEERING COLLEGE
ESTABLISHED BY MAHENDRA
EDUCATIONAL TRUST REP. BY ITS
M.D. NAMAKKAL DISRICT ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE
CONSTITUTED FOR FIXATION OF
FEE FOR PRIVATE PROFESSIONAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP. BY ITS
REGISTRAR, SARDAR VALLABAI
PATEL ROAD, GUINDY, CHENNAI 25 .Respondents

WP.26148/2004

1 SREE SASTHA INSTITUTE OF ENGINEERING,
TRICHY, REP. BY CHAIRMAN. .Petitioner

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED
FOR FEE FOR PRIVATE PROFESSIONAL
EDU.INS.REP.BY ITS SECRETARY,
HIGH. EDU.DEPT..CHENNAI- 9

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP.BY ITS REG
SARDAR VALLABAI PATAL ROAD,
GUINDY,CHENNAI-25 ..Respondents

WP.26149/2004

1 ST.JOSEPHS COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
REP. BY CHAIRMAN ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTE
D FOR OF FEE FOR PRIVATE PROFE-
SSIONAL EDU.INS.REP.BY ITS SECRETARY
HIGH.EDU.DEP.CHENNAI-9

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP.BY ITS REGISTRAR
SARDAR VALLABAI PATEL ROAD,
GUNIDY, CHENNAI-25 RESPONDENTS

WP.26150/2004

1 PANIMALAR INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT,
REP. BY SECRETARY ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMM.CONSITIUTED FOR
FIXATION OF FEE FOR PRIVATE PROFESSONAL
EDUC.INST.REP.BY ITS SECRETARY,
HIGH.EDU.DEPT. CHENNAI-9

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP. BY ITS RE
GISTRAR,SARDAR VALLABAI PATEL
ROAD,GUNIDY,CHENNAI-25 ..Respondents

WP.26151/2004

1 PANIMALAR ENGINEERING COLLEGE
REP. BY SECRETARY .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMM.CON.FOR FIX.OF
FEE FOR FOR PRIVATE PROFFESSIONAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION,
REP.BY ITS SECRETARY.,HIGHER EDUC.DEPT.,
CHENNAI-9

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP.BY ITS REGISTRAR
SARDAR VALLABAI PATAL ROAD,
GUINDY,CHENNAI-25 .. RESPONDENTS

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

WP.26152/2004

1 MADHA ENGINEERING COLLEGE
ESTABLISHED BY SOOSAIYA EDUCAIONAL
TRUST, REP. BY CHAIRMAN ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 PER.COMM.CON.FOR FIX.OF FEE PRIVATE
PROFESSIONAL EDU.INST.REP.BY
ITS SECRETARY,.HIGH.EDU.DEPT.CHENNAI
6000009

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REPRESENTED BY
ITS REGISTRAR, SARDAR VALLABAI PATEL
ROAD,GUINDY,CHENNAI-25. ..RESPONDENTS

WP.26153/2004

1 JEPPIAAR ENGINEERING COLLEGE
REP .BY ITS CHARIMAN ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED
FOR PRIVATE PROFESSIONAL EDU
P.P.E.I REP BY ITS SECRETARY.HIGHER
EDN.DEPT. CHENNAI-9

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REPRESENTED BY
ITS REGISTRAR, SARDAR VALLABAI PATEL
ROAD,GUINDY,CHENNAI-25. ..RESPONDENTS

WP.26906/2004

1 SSM COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
REP. BY ITS ADMINISTRATIVE
OFFICER,
KOMARAPALAYAM-183. .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 PER. COMMITTEE CONS. FOR FIX.
OF FEE FOR PRIVATE PROF.
EDU.INS. REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
HIGHER EDU. DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP. BY ITS
REGISTRAR, SARDAR VALLABAI
PATEL ROAD, GUINDY,
CHENNAI-25. ..RESPONDENTS

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

WP.26907/2004

1 ST. MARY'S SCHOOL OF MANAGE-
-MENT STUDIES, REP. BY ITS
CHAIRMAN, JEPPIAAR NAGAR,
CHENNAI-600 119. ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 PER. COMMITTEE CONS. FOR FIX.
OF FEE FOR PRIVATE PROF.
EDU.INS. REP. BY ITS SECRETARY
HIGHER EDU. DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP. BY ITS
REGISTRAR, SARDAR VALLABAI
PATEL ROAD, GUINDY,
CHENNAI-25. ..RESPONDENTS

WP.27332/2004

1 RAGAS DENTAL COLLEGE AND
HOSPITAL BY SECRETARY
UTHANDI, CHENNAI ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 THE SECRETARY, HEALTH AND
FAMILY WELFARE DEPARTMENT
CHENNAI-9

2 COMMITTEE FOR FIXATION OF FEE
IN UNAIDED PRIVATE PROFESSIONL
EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, BY
MEMBER SECRETARY, CHENNAI-28

3 ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION/THE SECRETARY,
SELECTION COMMITTEE,DIRECTORAT
OF MEDICAL EDUCATION,CHENNAI

4 THE TAMILNADU DR.M.G.R.MEDICAL
UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI BY
REGISTRAR, CHENNAI-32 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.27358/2004

1 SAVEETHA DENTAL COLLEGE AND
HOSPITAL, REP BY DIRECTOR
CHENNAI-77 ..PETITIONERS

Vs.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU
REP BY ITS SECRETARY,HEALTH
AND FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
CHENNAI-9.

2 COMMITTEE FOR FIXATION OF FEE
IN UNAIDED PRIVATE PROFESSIONL
EDUCATIONAL ISNTITUTIONS
(MINORITY & NON-MINORITY) CHENNAI.

3 THE ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR OF
MEDICAL EDUCATION/SECRETARY
SELECTION COMMITTEE,
CHENNAI-10.

4 THE TAMILNADU DR.MGR MEDICAL
UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI, REP BY
ITS REGISTRAR
CHENNAI-32. ..RESPONDENTS

WP.28281/2004

1 SAVEETHA ENGINEERING COLLEGE,
SAVEETHA MEDICAL & EDUCATIONAL
TRUST, REP. BY ITS PRESIDENT
DR. N.M. VEERAIYAN. ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 THE GOVT. OF TAMILNADU,
REP.BY ITS SECRETATRY, HIGHER
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9

2 COMMITTEE FOR FIXATION OF FEE
IN UNAIDED PRIVATE PROFESSIONAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS,
REP.BY ITS SECRETARY, CHENNAI

3 THE DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL EDUC-
ATION,
CHENNAI-32

4 THE ANNA UNIVERSITY,
REP.BY ITS REGISTRAR,
CHENNAI-32 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.28799/2004

1 MAHENDRA ENGINEERING COLLEGE,
ESTB BY MAHENDRA EDUCATIONAL
TRUST REP. BY ITS M.D., MAHEN-
DHRAPURI, VADUGAPALAYAM POST. ..PETITIONER

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED
FOR FIXATION OF FEE FOR PVT.
PROFESSIONSL EDUCATIONAL INS-
TITUTIONS REP.BY ITS SECRETARY.

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP. BY ITS
REGISTRAR, SARDAR VALLABAI
PATEL ROAD, GUINDY, CHENNAI-25 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.30650/2004

1 RAGAS DENTAL COLLEGE AND
HOSPITAL, BY SECRETARY
UTHANDI, CHENNAI-119

Vs.

1 THE SECRETARY, HEALTH AND
FAMILY WELFARE DEPARTMENT
CHENNAI-9

2 COMMITTEE FOR FIXATION OF FEE
IN UNAIDED PVT. PROFESSIONAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
BY MEMBER-SECRETARY., CHENNAI-28

3 THE ADDL. DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION/SECRETARY,SELECTION
COMMITTEE, DIRECTORATE OF
MEDICAL EDN. CHENNAI-10

4 THE TAMILNADU DR.M.G.R.MEDICAL
UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI BY
REGISTRAR, CHENNAI-32 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.30980/2004

1 T.VELMURUGAN

2 V.RAMAKRISHNAN

3 SIVAMANI

4 V.ETHIRAJ

5 M.PALANICHAMI

6 R.ARUL MOHAN

7 N.BALUCHAMY

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

8 M.MURUGESAN

9 E.MANOHARAN

10 SHANTHILAL A.JAIN

11 M.SHANMUGAM

12 HABEEBULLHA

13 S.DEVADASS

14 V.GOVINDARAJU

15 M.VETRIVEL

16 G.KANNAIYAN

17 V.THAMBITHURAI

18 S.SOMASUNDARAM

19 P.PALANIAPPAN

20 DR.I.ARUMUGAM

21 A.L.SUKUMARAN ..Petitioners

Vs.

1 THE GOVERNMENT OF TAMILNADU
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY TO GOVT
OF TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND
FAMILY WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 COMMITTEE FOR FIXATION OF FEE
IN UNAIDED PRIVATE
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL
INSTITUTIONS, CHENNAI 28'

3 ADDITIONAL SECRETARY OF
MEDICAL EDUCATION,
THE SECRETARY, SELECTION
COMMITTEE, CHENNAI 6

4 TE TAMILNADU DR.MGR MEDICAL
UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI REP.BY
ITS REGISTRAR, CHENNAI 32

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

5 SAVEETHA DENTAL COLLEGE AND
HOSPITAL, REP. BY ITS DIRECTOR
162, POONAMALLEE HIGH ROAD
VELAPPANCHAVADI, CHENNAI 77 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.32210/2004

1 SRI KRISHNA COLLEGE OF
ENGINEERING & TECH ESTABLISHED
BY SRI KRISHNA TRUST REP BY ITS
PRINCIPAL KUNIAMUTHUR PO
COIMBATORE ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTE
FOR FIXATION OF FEE FOR PVT.
PROF. EDU INST REP BY ITS SECRETARY,
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPT CHENNAI 9

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REP BY ITS
REGISTRAR SARDAR VALLABAI
PATEL ROAD
GUINDY CHENNAI 25 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.32989/2004

1 I. SARASWATHI ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
ITS SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

2 RAGAS DENTAL COLLEGE AND
HOSPITAL, REP. BY PRINCIPAL
2/102 EAST COAST ROAD
UTHANDI, CHENNAI-119. ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33557/2004

1 V.BRINDAA LAKSHMI

2 K.REKHA

3 R.RUKSHALI

4 S.BARANI KUMARI

5 D.SHARMILA

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

6 M.KALADEVI

7 D.PRIYADHARSHINI

8 S.PADMA

9 J.JAYALAKSHMI

10 K.SHRUTHI

11 K.SHEELA KUMARI

12 ABISHEK JOHNSON BABU ..PETITIONERS

Vs.

1 UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION
BY CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL EDN.
TESTING, SOUTH CAMPUS,
NEW DELHI

2 SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9

3 DR.M.G.R.MEDICAL UNIVERSITY
BY REGISTRAR
GUINDY, CHENNAI

4 THE MANAGEMENT TRUSTEE
NEW NO.61, RAMASAMY SALAI
K.K.NAGAR, CHENNAI-78

5 THE DENTAL COUNCIL OF INDIA
BY SECRETARY, TEMPLE LANE
KOTLA ROAD, NEW DELHI

6 THE CHAIRMAN, MR.JUSTICE
A.RAMAN COMMITTEE, NEAR JUDGE
QUARTERS, RAJAANNAMALAIPURAM
CHENNAI-28 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33558/2004

1 L.J.SAI LAKSHMI

2 MANOJ

3 M.AMBIKA ..PETITIONERS

Vs.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

1 UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMISSION
BY CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL EDN.
TESTING, SOUTH CAMPUS,
NEW DELHI

2 SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
HIGHER EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9

3 DR.M.G.R.MEDICAL UNIVERSITY
BY REGISTRAR
GUINDY, CHENNAI

4 THE MANAGEMENT TRUSTEE
NEW NO.61, RAMASAMY SALAI
K.K.NAGAR, CHENNAI-78

5 THE DENTAL COUNCIL OF INDIA
BY SECRETARY, TEMPLE LANE
KOTLA ROAD, NEW DELHI

6 THE CHAIRMAN, MR.JUSTICE
A.RAMAN COMMITTEE, NEAR JUDGE
QUARTERS, RAJAANNAMALAIPURAM
CHENNAI-28 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33824/2004

1 R.BABU ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33825/2004

1 J.VENKATESAN ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33826/2004

1 DR.S.SAITHAN RANGAN ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552

WP.33827/2004

1 V.SUBBURAJ .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33828/2004

1 DR.P.BALASUBRAMANIAM ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33829/2004

1 DR.R.HARIBABU ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33830/2004

1 DR.V.BALU ..Petitioner

Vs.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552

WP.33831/2004

1 DR.M.PRABAKARAN ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..Respondents

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

WP.33832/2004

1 N.GUNASEKARAN ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..Respondents

WP.33833/2004

1 DR.P.KULASEKARAN ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 .RESPONDENTS

WP.33834/2004

1.V.MANOHARAN ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU REP. BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH AND FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT, CHENNAI 9

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDICAL COUNCIL, AIWAN E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD,
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR
DR MGR UNIVERSITY
GUINDY, CHENNAI 32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI 10

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..Respondents

WP.33850/2004

1 C.H.BHASKAR RAO ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH & FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33851/2004

1 G. VENKATASUBRAMANIAM .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH & FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33852/2004

1 DR.R.SATHYANARAYANAN ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH & FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD, NEW DELHI 110 002

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33853/2004

1 M. BALAGANESAN .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH & FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WEB COPY

WP.33854/2004

1 V. SUDARSANAM ..PETITIONER

Vs.

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH & FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33855/2004

1 S.MUNIRATNAM .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH & FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 .RESPONDENTS

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

WP.33856/2004

1 M. RAJENDAR RAJU ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH & FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 .RESPONDENTS

WP.33857/2004

1 M.R.SATYAMURTHY ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH & FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33858/2004

1 A.R.ELANGOVAN .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
THE SECRETARY, GOVERNMENT OF
TAMILNADU, HEALTH & FAMILY
WELFARE DEPT., CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..Respondents

WP.33866/2004

1 S.RAVICHAND .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY THE
SECRETARY, GOVT. OF TAMILNADU
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 .RESPONDENTS

WP.33867/2004

1 NEDUNCHEZHIAN ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY THE
SECRETARY, GOVT. OF TAMILNADU
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..Respondents

WP.33868/2004

WEB COPY

1 A.NAGARAJAN .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY THE
SECRETARY, GOVT. OF TAMILNADU
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 .RESPONDENTS

WP.33869/2004

1 KUGANATHAN ..Petitioner .

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY THE
SECRETARY, GOVT. OF TAMILNADU
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33870/2004

1 S. ASHOK KUMAR ..Petitioner

Vs.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY THE
SECRETARY, GOVT. OF TAMILNADU
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 .RESPONDENTS

WP.33871/2004

1 R. BHAVANI .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY THE
SECRETARY, GOVT. OF TAMILNADU
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

WP.33872/2004

1 R. JAYAGAR ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY THE
SECRETARY, GOVT. OF TAMILNADU
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33873/2004

1 D. VENKATESAN ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY THE
SECRETARY, GOVT. OF TAMILNADU
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.33874/2004

1 D. VENKATESAN .PETITIONER

Vs.

1 STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY THE
SECRETARY, GOVT. OF TAMILNADU
HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

2 THE SECRETARY, ALL INDIA
MEDIAL COUNCIL, AIWAN-E GALIB
MARG, KOTLA ROAD
NEW DELHI 110 002

3 THE REGISTRAR, DR.MGR
UNIVERSITY, GUINDY
CHENNAI-32

4 THE DIRECTOR OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION, KILPAUK,
CHENNAI-10.

5 MEENAKSHI MEDICAL COLLEGE
HOSPITAL AND RESEARCH
INSTITUTE, ENATHUR,
KANCHEEPURAM 631 552 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.34514/2004

1 SAVEETHA DENTAL COLLEGE AND
HOSPITAL, REP BY ITS DEAN
CHENNAI-77 ..Petitioner

Vs.

1 THE GOVT. OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
ITS SECRETARY, HEALTH &
FAMILY WELFARE DEPT.,
CHENNAI-9.

2 COMMITTEE FOR FIXATION OF FEE
IN UNAIDED PRIVATE PROFESIONAL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS,
(MINORITY & NON-MINORITY)CH-28

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

3 THE ADDITIONAL DIRECTOR OF
MEDICAL EDUCATION/SECRETARY,
SELECTION COMMITTEE,
DIRECTORATE OF MEDICAL
EDUCATION,
CHENNAI-10

4 THE TAMILNADU DR.MGR MEDICAL
UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI
REP BY ITS REGISTRAR
CHENNAI-32. ..RESPONDENTS

WP.34528/2004

1 ERODE SENGUNTHAR ENGINEERING
COLLEGE, REP BY CORRESPONDENT
J.SUDHANANDHEN
ERODE ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 THE GOVT. OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
ITS SECRETARY, HIGHER
EDUCATION DEPT., FORT ST.
GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

2 COMMITTEE FOR FIXATION OF FEE
IN UNAIDED PRIVATE PROFESSIONL
EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS,
(MIN. & NON-MIN.) REP MEMBER -SECRETARY

3 THE DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL
EDUCATION, CHENNAI-32

4 THE ANNA UNIVERSITY
REP. BY ITS REGISTRAR
CHENNAI-32. ..RESPONDENTS

WP.35771/2004

1 V.B.SATHISH, MINOR, REP BY HIS
FATHER V.P.BALAKRISHNAN
SALEM ..PETITIONER

Vs.

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU, REP BY
ITS SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,
FORT ST.GEORGE, CHENNAI-9.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

2 RAGAS DENTAL COLLEE AND
HOSPITAL, REP BY ITS PRINCIPAL
2/102 EAST COAST ROAD
UTHANDI, CHENNAI-119. ..RESPONDENTS

WP.36883/2004

1 SANJEEV KUMAR

2 R.MUTHUKUMARAN

3 G.MATHIYALAGAN [MINOR]
REP. BY HIS FATHER MADHANKUMAR

4 K.HEMA

5 P.KRISHNAN[MINOR]
REP. BY HIS MOTHER SANGEETHA

6 G.VENKATESAN

7 T.SATHYA

8 A.V.RAMANATHAN

9 V.KARUNAKARAN

10 P.MUTULAKSHMI [MINOR]
REP. BY HER FATHER K.BALAJI

11 D.SIVAKUMAR

12 V.PONMUDI[MINOR]
REP. BY HIS MOTHER P.SINDHU

13 D.IYYANDURAI [MINOR]
REP. BY HIS MOTHER I.POOVIZHI

14 M.MADASAMY [MINOR]
REP. BY HIS FATHER M.GANESH RAJA

15 V.JAYARAMAN [MINOR]
REP. BY HIS FATHER J.VINOTHRAJ

16 R.RATHIDEVI

17 A.REVATHI ..PETITIONERS

Vs.

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

1 THE STATE OF TAMILNADU,REP.BY
ITS SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT,FORT ST,
GEORGE CHENNAI 9

2 SAVEETHA DENTAL COLLEGE AND
HOSPITAL, REP.BY ITS DIRECTOR
162,POONAMALLEE HIGH ROAD,
VELAPPANCHAVADI CHENNAI 77 ..RESPONDENTS

WP.25652 of 2004:

Sri Sastha Institute of Engineering and
Technology, rep. By its Chairman
Chennai-103 ..Petitioner

vs

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED
FOR FIXATIONOF FEE PRIVATE
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL INST.,
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,.HIGH.EDU.DEPT.
CHENNAI 6000009

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REPRESENTED BY
ITS REGISTRAR, SARDAR VALLABAI PATEL
ROAD,GUINDY,CHENNAI-25. ..RESPONDENTS

WP.25653/2004

MADHA ENGINEERING COLLEGE
REP. BY ITS CHAIRMAN,
CHENNAI-83 ..Petitioner

VS

1 PERMANENT COMMITTEE CONSTITUTED
FOR FIXATIONOF FEE PRIVATE
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL INST.,
REP. BY ITS SECRETARY,.HIGH.EDU.DEPT.
CHENNAI 6000009

2 ANNA UNIVERSITY REPRESENTED BY
ITS REGISTRAR, SARDAR VALLABAI PATEL
ROAD,GUINDY,CHENNAI-25. ..RESPONDENTS

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

W.P.34136/2004:

1.Deepta Ramarao
2.R.J.Rajalakshmi
3.Shubhakara,L
4.S.K.Gayathri
5. T.Ramya,
6.S.Dhanalakshmi
7.V.Sandhiyaa
8.M.Deivanayagi
9. U.Durga
10.V.sangeetha
11.S.Kapil Dev Kumar
12.T.T.Kathikeyan
13.E.P.Kailash Nath
14.G.Yvaraja
15.M.Premkumar
16.R.Antonette Rhea
17.S.Subha
18.T.Anitha
19.G.Devi Rathna
20.S.Nasreen
21.V.Subashini
22.A.M.Ramhya
23.S.Menagapriyatharshini
24.S.Karthikeyan
25.M.Ganesh Kumar
26.M.M.Ramya Devi
27.A.Sasi Rekha
28.J.Gifrina
29.C.Indumathi ..Petitioners

vs.

1.The State of Tamil Nadu, rep.
By its Secretary to Govt.,
Education Department,
Fort St. George,
Chennai.

2. Ragas Dental College
rep. By its Prinicipal
Chennai - 119. ..Respondents

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Writ Appeals preferred against the order dated 24.11.04 and made in WPMP Nos. 39906 and 41267/04 in WP Nos. 32989 and 34136/04 respectively.

Writ Petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying to issue Writs of Mandamus directing the Respondent to comply with the order of the Hon'ble supreme Court in Islamic Academy of Education and another -Vs- State of Karnataka and others dated 14.8.2003 (reported in 2003 (6) SCC 697) in the matter of fee structure for the BDS Course in so far as the petitioner is concerned in each of the petitions and Mandamus directing the Respondent College to retain the fee for the 1st year BDS Course for the Academic year 2004-2005 as fixed by the Respondent (ie) Committee for fixation of fee and conveyed by the Respondent (ie) Selection committee in his Communication bearing No. 1188/SCS-1 (2)/ 2004, dated 16.8.2004 addressed to all the self financing Dental Colleges and Mandamus for bearing the Respondent from collecting any Tution fee higher than that fixed by the State Govt. or by the UGC as may be applicable, from the petitioner(s) in respect of the BDS Course and to direct the Concerned College to adjust the surplus sum collected from the petitioner[s] in the 1st Year BDS Course towards the fees payable for the subsequant years and declaring that the petitioner is liable to pay only a sum of Rs. 1,30,000/- from the academic year 2004-2005 to 2006-2007 as fees inclusive of all fees as applicable and Consequently direct the respondent Institution to collect only the said fee from the Academic year 2004-2005 to 2006-2007 and refund the excess fees collected from the petitioner for the Academic year 2003-2004 to the petitioner in each of the petitions and certiorarified mandamus calling for the records of the Respondents relating to the order of the Respondent in Ref. NO. 1188/SCS-1(2)/2004 dated 16.8.2004 and quash the same in so far as the determination of fees and directing the Respondents to fix the fees for BDS course by considering the claim of the Petitioner in each of the petitions in consonance with the ruling in Islanmic Academy case and Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records as comprsied in proceedings No. SFPC/PC on the file of the permanent Committee for fixation of fee for Private professional Educational Institutions and quash the same in so far as the petitioner in each of the petitions is concerned and consequently direct the Respondents to fix the fee structure for under Graduates (under & Post) for both the Courses (Dental & Engineering) after holding a full fledged enquiry on the respective representations in each of the Petitions.

WEB COPY

W.A.Nos.4059 & 4060 of 2004:

Mrs. Nalini Chidambaram Sr. Counsel for M/s.Gladys Daniel ... for appellant.
Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy,Sr. Counsel for M/s.Muthumani Doraisamy
...for R2.
Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader for R1.

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

W.P.Nos.30650 and 27332 of 2004:

Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy, Sr.counsel for Mr.Kandavadivel Doraisamy ... for petitioner.

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Addl.Advocate General/Sr. Counsel for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R1 and R3.
Mr.Vellaisamy ...for R4.

W.P.Nos.24209, 24210, 24652, 24653, 24523, 24248, 25377, 26148 to 26153, 26906, 26907, 28799 and 32210 of 2004:

Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy, Sr. Counsel for Mr.V.Ayyadurai ... for petitioner

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Sr. Counsel/Addl. Advocate General for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R1.

Mr.G.Masilamani, Sr. Counsel for M/s.G.M.Mani Associates .. for R2.

W.P.Nos.33824 to 33834, 33850 to 33858 and 33866 to 33874 of 2004:

Mr.K.Chandrasekaran ... for petitioner.

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Sr. Counsel/Addl. Advocate General for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R1 & R4

Mr.Vijay Narayan, Sr. Counsel ...for R2.

Mr.Vellaisamy ...for R3.

Mr.G.Masilamani, Sr. Counsel for M/s.G.M.Mani Associates ... for R5.

W.P.No.30980 of 2004:

Mr.G.R.Swaminathan ... for petitioner.

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Sr. Counsel/Addl. Advocate General for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R1 & R3

Mr.Vellaisamy ...for R4.

WEB COPY

W.P.Nos.32989 & 34136 of 2004:

Mrs.Nalini Chidambaram, Sr. Counsel for M/s.Gladys Daniel ... for petitioner.

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Sr. Counsel/Addl. Advocate General for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R1

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

W.P.No.33557 & 33558 of 2004:

Mr.P.V.S.Giridhar for M/s.P.V.S.Giridhar Associates ...for petitioner.

Mr.Vijay Narayan, Sr. Counsel ... for R1 & R5.

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Sr. Counsel/Addl. Advocate General for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R2

Mr.Vellaisamy ... for R3.

W.P.No.34528 of 2004:

Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy, Sr. Counsel for Mr.Kandavadivel Doraisamy ... for petitioner.

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Sr. Counsel/Addl. Advocate General for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R1 & R3

Mr.G.Masilamani, Sr. Counsel for M/s.G.M.Mani Associates ... for R4.

W.P.Nos.34514 and 27358 of 2004:

Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy, Sr. Counsel for Mr.Kandavadivel Doraisamy ... for petitioner.

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Sr. Counsel/Addl. Advocate General for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R1 & R3

Mr.Vellaisamy ... for R4.

W.P.No.28281 of 2004:

Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy, Sr. Counsel for Mr.Kandavadivel Doraisamy ... for petitioner.

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Sr. Counsel/Addl. Advocate General for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R1 & R3

Mr.G.Masilamani, Sr. Counsel for M/s.G.M.Mani Associates ... for R4.

W.P.No.36883 of 2004:

Mrs.Nalini Chidambaram, Sr. Counsel for M/s.Gladys Daniel ...for petitioner.

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Sr. Counsel/Addl. Advocate General for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R1

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy, Sr. Counsel for Mr.Kandavadivel Doraisami ... for R2.

W.P.No.35771 of 2004:

Mrs.Nalini Chidambaram, Sr. Counsel for M/s.Gladys Daniel ...for petitioner.

Mr.A.L.Somayaji, Sr. Counsel/Addl. Advocate General for Mr.V.Raghupathy, Govt. Pleader ... for R1

.....

JUDGMENT

N.V.BALASUBRAMANIAN,J.

The common point that arises in this batch of cases, some of them being writ petitions filed by the management of self-financing professional colleges, some being writ petitions filed by the students and some being writ appeals preferred against interim orders passed by a learned Judge of this Court, is the validity of the order of the Permanent Committee for the Fixation of Fee for private professional educational institutions in the State of Tamil Nadu fixing the fees payable by the students in respect of self-financing professional colleges of medicines, health science, para-medical courses like, M.B.B.S., B.D.S., M.D.S., etc. We heard all the matters together.

2. Since the points that arise in the cases are common, it will be convenient to refer to the averments made in one or two writ petitions filed by the colleges and the averments made in some of the writ petitions filed by the students.

3. W.P.No.30650 of 2004 is filed by Ragas Dental College and Hospital and the petition has been filed for the issue of a writ of Certiorarified Mandamus calling for the records in Proceedings No.SFPC/PC on the file of the Permanent Committee for Fixation of Fee for Private Professional Educational Institutions dated 13.8.2004 and quash the same. The main ground of challenge is that the Permanent Committee, while fixing the fee structure, has failed to take note of the relevant factors as indicated by the Supreme Court in ISLAMIC ACADEMY OF EDUCATION V. STATE OF KARNATAKA (2003) 6 SCC 697 - hereinafter referred to as Islamic Academy case) and the Permanent Committee was not correct in fixing the fee for all the colleges at a uniform rate in spite of the fact that each and every institution had made claim based on infrastructure, facilities and amenities available in the individual institution. It is the case of the management that the Permanent Committee acted beyond the directions of the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case. It is stated that though the petitioner supplied materials, but the Permanent Committee has not observed the principles of natural

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

justice by giving a reasonable opportunity to the institution to represent its case. It is the case of the management that the representations submitted along with supporting materials were not considered by the Permanent Committee and the Permanent Committee failed to adhere to the directions of the Supreme Court in the matter of fixation of fee structure. The petitioner referred to the location of the institution and its advantages and the salary payable and paid to the teaching and non-teaching staff as per the UGC norms. It is stated that the management of the self-financing colleges are not treating the students allotted under the Government seats on par with the students admitted by the management and hence, for the grounds raised in the writ petition, it is prayed that the order of the Permanent Committee should be quashed.

4. In another writ petition filed by one of the colleges (W.P.No.34528 of 2004), it is stated that the petitioner college has submitted representation before the Permanent Committee along with material particulars which are necessary to fix the fee in respect of the petitioner institution for different courses in B.E. The ground of challenge is that the fee structure has to be fixed depending upon the available infrastructure and other amenities on the basis of cost plus method of a particular institution and there is no scope for uniform fees. According to the petitioner, the Permanent Committee has not taken into account the relevant factors as directed by the Supreme Court, but fixed the fee structure mechanically. It is stated that there is violation of the principles of natural justice and violation of fundamental rights. It is stated that the Permanent Committee has not taken into consideration the directions of the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case. It is further stated that the petitioner college has got many development schemes and is estimated to provide further amenities which require fixation of enhanced fee. Hence, it is prayed that the order of the Permanent Committee should be quashed.

5. As far as writ petitions filed by the students are concerned, we take up W.P.No.33824 of 2004. It is the case of the petitioner in W.P.No.33824 of 2004 that the fifth respondent therein, namely, Meenakshi Medical College is granted the status of Deemed University. This would have no effect in so far as the petitioner and other similarly placed students as they have been admitted in the academic year 2003-04 and the recommendation of Raman Committee is very much applicable to them and UGC has also fixed for the academic year 2004-05 the fees for MBBS at Rs.1,30,000/- and it is not open to the college to collect fees more than what is fixed by the Permanent Committee. It is also stated that the fees collected for the academic year 2003-04 is excessive when compared to the fee structure for the academic years 2004-05 to 2006-7 fixed at Rs.1,30,000/- and hence, the excess fee collected for the academic year 2003-04 is illegal and the college is bound to refund the excess fees collected. It is therefore prayed for the issue of a writ of declaration to declare that the petitioner is liable to pay only a sum of Rs.1,30,000/- from the academic year 2004-05 to 2006-07 as fees inclusive of annual fees and other fees

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

like, admission fees, tuition fees, special fees, laboratory/computer fees, internet fees, library fees, sports fees, placement and training fees, development fees, maintenance and amenities fees, extra-curriculum activities fees and other recurring expenses to the college and consequently direct the institution to collect only the said fee from the academic year 2004-05 to 2006-07 and refund the excess fees collected from the student for the academic year 2003-04.

6. In one another writ petition filed by a student in W.P.No.32989 of 2004, the petitioner has referred to the decision of the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case and the report of the Committee. It is stated that the college, the second respondent in the writ petition, commenced the second year BDS course even before the announcement of results for the first year and the students were asked to pay a sum of Rs.1,60,000/- immediately and the students sent a written representation to the college stating that they are obliged to pay only the fees fixed by the Committee, but however, on 10.11.2004 it was informed by the college by an undated letter that the second year students should pay Rs.1,59,000/- in two instalments without giving the details regarding the writ petition filed and interim orders obtained from this Court. The petitioner referred to the representation made by the students to the Government dated 11.11.2004 requesting the Government to direct the college to comply with the order of the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case. It is stated that in the writ petition filed by the college, the students have not been impleaded as parties. It is stated that the students who joined the BDS course in the year 2002-03 are paying only Rs.50,000/- as annual fee and the students who joined the course in the year 2004-05 are paying only Rs.75,000/- and hence, it is unreasonable to direct the students who joined the course in 2003-04 to pay Rs.1,60,000/- as fees. It is stated that the students who joined in the year 2003-04 are being singled out for discriminatory treatment. Hence, the writ petition has been filed for the issue of a writ of Mandamus to comply with the order of the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case in the matter of fee structure for BDS course in so far as the petitioner is concerned.

7. In another writ petition filed by some of the students in W.P.No.30980 of 2004, the respondent college is a dental college. The writ petition has been filed to direct the college to retain the fee of Rs.75,000/- for the first year B.D.S. course for the academic year 2004-05 as fixed by the Committee. The averments made in the writ petition are also similar to the other writ petitions filed by the students.

8. In another writ petition, W.P.No.33557 of 2004 the students are challenging the demand of Rs.2,50,000/- as tuition fees for B.D.S. course for the academic year 2004-05 in the fourth respondent college. It is stated that even assuming without admitting that in view of the Deemed University status conferred upon the college for the year 2004-05, the college would be entitled to collect a fee of

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

Rs.1,00,000/- as fixed by the UGC, the fee for the first and second year would aggregate only to Rs.1,55,000/-. Hence, the petition has been filed for the issue of a writ of Mandamus to forbear the college from collecting any tuition fee higher than that fixed either by the State Government or by the UGC in respect of B.D.S. course and to direct the college to adjust the surplus amount collected from the petitioner/students in the year first year of B.D.S. course towards the fees payable by them for the subsequent years.

9. Though a number of writ petitions have been filed, we have gone through the same and the points raised in all the petitioners are more or less similar.

10. Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy, learned senior counsel appearing for the management of some of self-financing colleges referred to the details of the writ petitions filed by the colleges as well as by the students and the background of the case. He submitted that the Permanent Committee by fixing a uniform annual fees of Rs.75,000/- for all dental colleges has overstepped its jurisdiction. His main submission was that the Permanent Committee has to approve the proposal submitted by "each institution" taking into account various factors including the infrastructure and facilities available, the investments made, salaries paid to the teachers and staff, future plans for expansion, etc. He submitted that "each institution" has the freedom to fix its own fee structure taking into consideration the need to generate funds to run the institution and to provide facilities necessary for the benefit of the students and the institution must also be able to generate surplus which must be used for the betterment and growth of the institution. He referred to the Islamic Academy Case and submitted that the Committee has not taken into consideration the various directions given by the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case and hence, the order of the Permanent Committee suffers from various legal infirmities. He also submitted that there is violation of the principles of natural justice as no opportunity was granted to the institution before the order proposing the fixation of fee structure was passed. He also submitted that there is violation of fundamental rights and there is no indication in the order of the Permanent Committee that the fees proposed by the college are fixed to make profiteering and the college is charging capitation fees. He therefore submitted that relevant factors have not been taken into consideration like, infrastructure, facilities available, investment made, salaries paid to the teachers and staff, etc. and hence, the order of the Permanent Committee is liable to be set aside. He also submitted that in so far as the students who were admitted in B.D.S. Course in the academic year 2003-04 and 2004-05 are concerned, the judgment in T.M.A.Pai Foundation v. State of Karnataka (2002) 8 SCC 481 – T.M.A.Pai Foundation case) would govern and the fee structure fixed by the management is subject to the result of the writ petition. In so far as 3rd and 4th year students in B.D.S. Course who were admitted in the year 2002 are concerned, the fees had already been fixed and hence, the students are not entitled to claim refund or even to

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

claim adjustment of the same. His foremost submission is that the Permanent Committee has failed to fix the fees for each institution, but merely fixed a uniform fee structure. He also submitted that the method adopted by the Permanent Committee in fixing the fee structure is not correct. He submitted that the fee fixed is inequitable and there are no materials at all to sustain the reasonings of the Permanent Committee. He submitted that the Permanent Committee has failed to consider the fact that MBA, MCA courses are taught in self-financing engineering colleges as also in the Arts colleges affiliated to various Universities in Tamil Nadu and fixing of uniform fee for all the institutions at the same rate would run contrary to the directions of the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case.

11. It is also useful to refer to the arguments of Mr.G.Masilamani, learned senior counsel appearing for Meenakshi Ammal Dental College and Meenakshi Medical College. His main submission was that on the basis of the decision of the Supreme Court in T.M.A.Pai Foundation case, which was clarified in Islamic Academy case a rigid, uniform fee structure cannot be fixed and "each institution" must have the freedom to fix its own fee structure taking into consideration the need to generate funds to run the institution and to provide facilities necessary for the benefit of the students. He also submitted that in so far as Meenakshi Medical College is concerned, taking into account the circumstances, the fee was fixed at Rs.3,95,000/- and the college is a Deemed University and the Government cannot interfere with the right of fixation of fee by the University and the college is justified and within its right to fix the fee of Rs.3,95,000/- per student. He also referred to the Income and Expenditure Account, the Balance Sheet and other particulars furnished to the Permanent Committee and submitted that the fee of Rs.3,95,000/- fixed for the Medical College is reasonable.

12. Mr.A.L.Somayaji, learned senior counsel/Additional Advocate General appearing for the Government submitted that there is no violation of the principles of natural justice as the Permanent Committee gave ample opportunity to all the colleges to make representation, but the colleges did not avail the opportunity. Mr.A.L.Somayaji, learned Additional Advocate General also submitted that the Permanent Committee has taken into consideration all the relevant factors and the directions of the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case and no case has been made out to interfere with the orders of the Permanent Committee.

13. Mrs.Nalini Chidambaram, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of some of the students referred to the decision in T.M.A.Pai Foundation case as well as Islamic Academy Case and submitted that fee has been fixed by the Committee and the demand for higher fee by the self-financing professional colleges is not legal and the colleges are to adhere to the fee structure fixed by the Committee. She also submitted that the fee of Rs.1,59,000/- fixed and collected from the students of BDS course is exorbitant. She submitted that

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

the Supreme Court has referred to a larger Bench for reconsideration of some points that arise out of the decisions in T.M.A.Pai Foundation case and Islamic Academy Case, particularly the fees payable by the students and hence, no reliance can be placed on the judgment in Islamic Academy case. Learned senior counsel also submitted that the Supreme Court has also passed interim orders to the effect that pending reconsideration of the decisions, the fee fixed by the Experts Committee should be charged. She also submitted that the fee fixed by the Committee is effective from the academic year 2003-04 and the excessive fees collected from the students during the academic year 2003-04 should be adjusted against the fees to be collected for the subsequent academic years as the students have paid the fees for the year 2003-04 subject to fixation of fees by the Committee.

14. Mr.K.Chandrasekaran, learned counsel appearing for some of the students submitted that the students are merit students and the seats have been allotted by the Director of Medical Education in Meenakshi Medical College. He submitted that they are all allotted under merit quota and they should be charged the fees as fixed by the Government for Government colleges. His alternative plea is that the fee collected by the college is exorbitant and he produced before the Court a tabular column showing that exorbitant fee was collected by the college. He also submitted that the Committee has taken into consideration all the aspects as held by the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case. His submission was that this Court is not an appellate authority sitting over the fees fixed by the Committee. He also submitted that there is no violation of the principles of natural justice. He submitted that though the college declared to be a Deemed University coming under the control of UGC, the students admitted in the academic year 2003-04 continue to be the students of Dr.MGR University and the UGC fixed Rs.1.30 lakhs per year for the students of the academic year 2004-05. He submitted that the students of the year 2004-05 are required to pay Rs.1.30 lakhs per year, while the students of the year 2003-04 are required to pay a sum of Rs.4.49 lakhs. He submitted that the excess fees paid by the students should be kept in Fixed Deposit and should be adjusted towards future fees as per the judgment in Islamic Academy case. After the conclusion of hearing, learned counsel also submitted that the students are asked to vacate the hostel and they are not allowed to take up the examinations also.

15. Mr.P.V.S.Giridhar, learned counsel appearing for some of the students submitted that Rs.2,50,000/- collected from the students of BDS course is not legal. He also submitted that the college is affiliated to Dr.MGR Medical University in so far as the students of the year 2003-04 are concerned and the Directorate of Medical Education for B.D.S. Course fixed only a sum of Rs.55,000/- for the academic year 2003-04, but there was a demand from the students to pay a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- for the second year. He therefore submitted that the demand of Rs.2,50,000/- is illegal as the college continues to be affiliated to Dr.MGR Medical University in so far as the students of the year 2003-04 are concerned and even

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

assuming the college has been conferred the Deemed University status, the maximum fee that it can charge is Rs.1,00,000/- as determined by the UGC for BDS course. He therefore submitted that since the students are required to pay only Rs.55,000/- per year, the excess amount collected which is lying in the college should be adjusted against the future fee to be collected from the students. He submitted that the demand of the college from the students of second year for payment of Rs.2,50,000/- for the academic year 2004-05 is illegal as it is exorbitant, arbitrary and against the judgment of the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case. He also submitted that under section 7 of the provisions of the Tamil Nadu Educational Institutions (Prohibition of collection of Capitation Fee) Act, 1992, if the college is charging a fee more than the sum prescribed by the Permanent Committee, the college is liable to be penalized.

16. We have carefully considered the submissions of learned senior counsel as well as learned counsel for the parties. In so far as the submission that there is violation of the principles of natural justice is concerned, we find that the State Government had constituted a Permanent Committee for the Fixation of Fee for Private Professional Educational Institutions and on the constitution of the Committee, the Committee issued notice to all the colleges and some of the colleges sent their representations with accounts. It is seen from the proceedings of the Committee dated 13.8.2004 that Mr.T.D.Naidu appeared before the Committee representing All India Medical and Engineering College Association and requested time to submit a representation on behalf of the said Association and accordingly, the time was granted, but he did not choose to appear before the Committee again as promised, nor has submitted any representation. The Committee has also reported that it heard the oral representations of three Dental colleges, namely, Saveetha Dental College, Ragas Dental College and Rajas Dental College and P.S.G. College of Medicine, and the Committee also heard the representatives of the Post Graduate Students (Dental Courses) from the above three Dental Colleges. The proceedings of the Committee make it clear that the Committee gave ample opportunity and issued notice to all the concerned colleges and the colleges also made representations and Mr.T.D.Naidu also appeared before the Committee on behalf of All India Medical and Engineering College Association who made a request for grant of time to submit a representation, but did not choose to appear before the Committee thereafter. It is apparent that the All India Medical and Engineering College Association did not avail the opportunity granted to it by the Permanent Committee and we hold that the order of the Committee is not liable to be set aside on the ground of violation of the principles of natural justice.

17. The main allegation made on behalf of the colleges is that the Committee has not taken into account the relevant factors as directed by the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case. Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy, learned senior counsel appearing for some of the colleges referred to paragraph-6 of the judgment and also other

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

portions of the judgment so far as it considers the question No.1 posed before it, namely, whether the educational institutions are entitled to fix their own fee structure. The Supreme Court, in answering the said question, held as under:-

> " 7. So far as the first question is concerned, in our view the majority judgment is very clear. There an be no fixing of a rigid fee structure by the Government. Each institute must have the freedom to fix its own fee structure taking into consideration the need to generate funds to run the institution and to provide facilities necessary for the benefit of the students. They must also be able to generate surplus which must be used for the betterment and growth of that educational institution. In paragraph 56 of the judgment it has been categorically laid down that the decision on the fees to be charged must necessarily be left to the private educational institutions that do not seek and which are not dependent upon any funds from the Government. Each institute will be entitled to have its own fee structure. The fee structure for each institute must be fixed keeping in mind the infrastructure and facilities available, the investments made, salaries paid to the teachers and staff, future plans for expansion and/or betterment of the institution etc. Of course there can be no profiteering and capitation fees cannot be charged. It thus needs to be emphasized that as per the majority judgment imparting of education is essentially charitable in nature. Thus the surplus/profit that can be generated must be only for the benefit/use of that educational institution. Profits/surplus cannot be diverted for any other use or purpose and cannot be used for personal gain or for any other business or enterprise. As, at present, there are statutes/regulations which govern the fixation of fees and as this Court has not yet considered the validity govern the fixation of fees and as this Court has not yet considered the validity of those statutes/regulations, we direct that in order to give effect to the judgment in T.M.A.Pai case (T.M.A.Pai Foundation v. State of Karnataka, (2002 8 SCC 481) the respective State Governments/concerned authority shall set up, in each State, a committee headed by a retired High Court Judge who shall be nominated by the Chief Justice of that State. The other member, who shall be nominated by the Judge, should be a Chartered Accountant of repute. A representative of the Medical Council

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

> of India (in short "MCI") or the All India Council for Technical Education (in short "AICTE"), depending on the type of institution, shall also be a member. The Secretary of the State Government in charge of Medical Education or Technical Education, as the case may be, shall be a member and Secretary of the Committee. The Committee should be free to nominate/co-opt another independent person of repute, so that the total number of members of the Committee shall not exceed five. Each educational institute must place before this Committee, well in advance of the academic year, its proposed fee structure. Along with the proposed fee structure all relevant documents and books of accounts must also be produced before the Committee for their scrutiny. The Committee shall then decide whether the fees proposed by that institute are justified and are not profiteering or charging capitation fee. The Committee will be at liberty to approve the fee structure or to propose some other fee which can be charged by the institute. The fee fixed by the Committee shall be binding for a period of three years, at the end of which period the institute would be at liberty to apply for revision. Once fees are fixed by the Committee, the institute cannot charge either directly or indirectly and other amount over and above the amount fixed as fees. If any other amount is charged, under any other head or guise e.g. donations, the same would amount to charging of capitation fee. The Governments/appropriate authorities should consider framing appropriate regulations, if not already framed whereunder if it is found that an institution is charging capitation fees or profiteering that institution can be appropriately penalised and also face the prospect of losing its recognition/affiliation."

18. We are unable to accept the submission of Mr.R.Krishnamoorthy, learned senior counsel appearing for some of the colleges. It is no doubt true that the Committee is required to fix the fee taking into account the need of each educational institution and the Committee must also take note of the need of the institution to generate funds to run the institution and to provide facilities for the benefit and betterment of students. In other words, the Committee is required to apply its mind to the amount of fees payable in each institution. The Supreme Court held that it is permissible for each institution to generate surplus funds which must be used for the growth of the institution and for the betterment of students and the only embargo that is placed by the Supreme Court is that the fee structure proposed should not be a

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

profit-making one and under the guise of charging fees, there should be no capitation fee charged. It is seen from the order of the Committee that the Committee has considered the number of students admitted in each institution, available facilities alleged to have been provided, infrastructure, promising development and all other allied factors and then, fixed the uniform maximum fee structure for each course. We are of the view, the order of the Committee is not liable to be interfered with only on the ground that the order does not indicate that the fees payable is with reference to each institution. We are of the view, the over all needs of all the institutions and the strength of the students were taken into consideration, and then the Committee fixed the maximum fee structure as prescribed in its order. We are of the view that the Committee is an expert body and it is not expected to write a detailed judgment. We have already noticed that only three colleges have submitted their proposals, and the representative of the All India Medical and Engineering College Association did not choose to appear before the Committee. The Permanent Committee, in the absence of any relevant materials forthcoming from the rest of the colleges or by the Association, has fixed the maximum fees payable by the students. Inso far as three colleges who have submitted their proposals are concerned, there is enough indication in the order of the Committee that it has applied its mind and fixed the fee structure. We are of the view that the mere fixation of a maximum uniform fee for all the colleges covered in its report is not a ground to hold that the Committee has not applied its mind to the relevant question or it has not kept in mind the principles laid down by the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case. In our view, the above observation of the Supreme Court that each institution should have a separate fee structure does not prohibit fixing a 'maximum fee', as has been done by the Committee, to prevent exploitation.

19. No doubt, the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case has held that the Permanent Committee should decide whether the fees proposed by an institute are justified and the institute is not charging capitation fees and there is no profiteering in the fees proposed by the institute. However, we are of the view that the Permanent Committee is not in any way precluded from fixing a uniform 'maximum' fee payable by the students of all the institutions concerned, and the fixation of a uniform maximum fee by itself is not a ground to interfere with the orders of the Permanent Committee. In Islamic Academy case, the Supreme Court has cautioned that fees so proposed by an institution should not be in the nature of profiteering or capitation fees. We therefore hold that since the above two criteria are satisfied by the Permanent Committee in fixing a uniform fee for the institutions concerned, the orders of the Permanent Committee cannot be interfered with only on the ground that the Permanent Committee has fixed a uniform fee for all the institutions concerned. Accordingly, we do not find any infirmity in the order of the Committee. Further, it is well settled by series of decisions that in the matter of judicial review, this Court is not sitting in appeal. The Supreme Court in K.VINOD KUMAR V. S.PALANISAMY (2003) 10 SCC 681: AIR 2003 SC 3171)

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

has held that in proceedings and decisions taken in administrative matters, the scope of judicial review is confined to the decision-making process and does not extend to the merits of the decision taken. Further, we have in RAMA.MUTHURAMALINGAM v. THE DEPUTY SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE reported in 2004 (5) CTC 554, held that the Court must exercise self-restraint in matters relating to administration in which the authorities are specialists and the Court which has no expertise in those matters should leave the same to the discretion of the authorities concerned.

20. As far as Engineering Colleges are concerned, the Committee in its order dated 8.6.2004 has found that none of the private engineering colleges has placed before the Committee its proposed fee structure along with relevant documents and books of account as directed by the Supreme Court. Hence, it cannot be stated that there is violation of the principles of natural justice in the order passed by the Committee dated 8.6.2004 fixing the fees for private professional engineering colleges. The Committee in its order has taken into account all relevant factors and considered the report of the experts of Educational Department and then, fixed the fee structure. In the absence of any material placed by the colleges, the colleges cannot complain that the Committee has fixed the fees on its own.

21. As far as the fees fixed for M.B.A. and M.C.A. courses are concerned, the position remains the same as that of engineering colleges as none of them has placed before the Committee its proposal with relevant documents. The Committee looked into the various fees payable by the students joining in M.C.A. and M.B.A. courses and then, fixed the fees on the basis of the report of the Experts Committee in G.O.Ms.No.218, Higher Education dated 24.6.2002. Since no relevant materials were placed before the Committee, the institutions cannot complain now that the fee structure fixed by the Committee is liable to be struck down.

22. We also hold that though Meenakshi Medical College is a Deemed University, it is still affiliated to Dr.M.G.R.University. Though it is stated that Meenakshi Medical College is challenging the fixation of fees by the U.G.C. In W.P.No.35581 of 2004 and it is stated that this Court has also granted interim stay in that petition, the said writ petition is not listed before us. However, since there is already an order of stay, it is not open to the students to claim that they are required to pay the fee fixed by the U.G.C. Equally, the college cannot fix the fee on its own and in the absence of enforceability of the fee fixed by the U.G.C., the college must follow the fee fixed by the Permanent Committee. Though the college claims to be a deemed University, still it is affiliated to Dr.M.G.R. University and it is not open to the college to charge fees on its own. We are of the view, if the college is permitted to fix the fee on its own accord then, it will go against the ratio of the decision of the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case as the Supreme Court has held that there should not be any profiteering and under the guise of collection of tuition fees, there should not be any capitaiton fees. Therefore, it is impermissible for the said college to fix the fees on its own and it

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

has to adhere to the fee fixed by the Committee as it is stated that the implementation of the fee structure fixed by the U.G.C. is stayed by the orders of this Court. It is also demonstrated before us that the fee charged is quite exorbitant and unreasonable and it cannot be sustained on any standard.

23. As far as the plea of the students that the fees for the academic year 2003-04 should also be on par with the fees prescribed by the Committee and the excess fees collected during the academic year 2003-04 should be adjusted against the future fees payable by the students is concerned, we find from the written submission made on behalf of the management of self-financing dental colleges that,

> "it is humbly submitted there is no substance having regard to the fact that the I and II year B.D.S. Course students who have been admitted during 2003-04 & 2004-05 i.e., after T.M.A.Pai's case are governed by the fee structure as proposed by the management subject to the writ petitions pending before this Hon'ble Court. The III & IV year students were admitted during the academic year 2000-02 whose fee structure had already been fixed in consonance with the fee fixed by the then Committee which is in terms of Unnikrishnan's scheme"

We also find that the Supreme Court has delivered the judgment in Islamic Academy case on 14th August, 2003 and the Committee was constituted as per the decision of the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case by order dated 19.3.2004 and the Committee submitted its reports for engineering courses on 8.6.2004 and for M.B.A. and M.C.A. courses on 23.8.2004 and for medical and dental courses on 13.8.2004. Since it is fairly admitted on behalf of the colleges that the students were admitted during the academic years 2003-04 and 2004-5 subject to the result of the writ petitions pending before this Court, we are of the view that the students would be required to pay only the fees as fixed by the Permanent Committee for the academic years 2003-04 and 2004-05. We therefore hold that the students who were admitted in the academic year 2003-04 are also required to pay the fees fixed by the Permanent Committee and if any excess payment has been made, the colleges are directed to adjust the same against any other fees payable by the students. The colleges are also directed to keep the balance money paid by the students for the academic year 2003-04 in fixed deposit as directed by the Supreme Court in Islamic Academy case. As far as the students who were admitted in the academic year 2002-03 are concerned, the fees already paid by them need not be adjusted or kept in fixed deposit, but they are required to pay fees for the academic years 2003-04 and 2004-05 as per the directions of the Permanent Committee. Further, it is made clear that the fee structure fixed for the academic year 2004-05 will be valid not only for the first year, but also for the second year, third year and fourth year courses as the case may be. It is also made clear that

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

the students, whether they are studying in the second year or in subsequent years, are required to pay the fees as prescribed by the Committee for the particular academic year and ensuing academic years covered in the report of the Permanent Committee and no more and nothing less.

24. All the writ appeals as well as the writ petitions are disposed of accordingly, with the above directions. No costs. Connected WA.MPs. and WP.M.Ps. are closed.

Sd/
Asst.Registrar

/true copy/

Sub Asst.Registrar

To

1. The Secretary to the Government
of Tamil Nadu, Higher Education Department,
Fort St. George, Chennai.

2. The Secretary,
Permanent Committee Constituted for Fixation of Fee Private
Professional Educational Institutions, Chennai 9.

3. The Registrar,
Anna University,
Sardar Vallabhai Patel Road,Guindy, Chennai 25.

4. The Secretary,
Health and Family Welfare Department,Chennai 9.

5. The Member-Secretary,
Committee for Fixation of Fee in Unaided
Private professional Education,
Institutions, Chennai 28.

6. The Additional Director of Medical
Education/The Secretary, Selection Committee,
Directorate of Medical Education,Chennai.

7. The Registrar,
The Tamil Nadu Dr.MGR Medical University,Chennai 32.

8. The Secretary,
The Committee for Fixation of fee in
Unaided Private Professional Educational Institutions,
(Minority & Non-Minority), Chennai.

WEB COPY
https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/

9. The Director of Technical Education,Chennai 32.

10. The Additional Secretary of Medical Education/
The Secretary Selection Committee,
Directorate of Medical Education,Chennai 6.

11. The Chairman,
University Grants Commission,
National Education,
Testing South Campus,New Delhi.

12. The Secretary,
The Dental Council of India,
Temple Lane, Kotla Road, New Delhi.

13. The Director of Medical Education,Kilpauk, Chennai.

14. The Secretary,
All India Medical Council AIWAN E GALIB Marg,
Kotla Road, New Delhi.

+ 1 CC to Mr.P.V.S.Giridhar, Advocate SR NO 2238

+ 1 CC to Mr.Gladys Daniel, Advocate SR NO 2235

+ 4 CCs to Mrs.Muthumani Doraisami, Advocate SR NO 2388

+ 10 Ccs to Mr.V.Ayyadurai, Advocate SR NO 2219

+ 1 CC to M/s.G.M.Mani Associates, Advocate SR NO 2432

+ 1 CC to Mr.K.Chandrasekaran, Advocate SR NO 2250

+ 3 Ccs to the G.P. (SR Nos.2335, 2333, 2334)

+ 3 Ccs to Mr.T.Meikandan, Advocate SR NO 2704

+ 1 CC to Mr.P.V.S.Giridhar Associates, SR NO 2501

WA.No.4059 & 4060 of 2004,
etc., batch

PV, RA, KSJ, PSJ [co]

MK,KK, GP

compared by NB & MK

WEB COPY

https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/